

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are present in the above-captioned application and have been subjected to restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-17, drawn to a method for making a piezoelectric transducer classified in class 264, subclass 430;

Group II: Claims 18-19, drawn to a method for making a piezoelectric transducer or an ultrasound transducer classified in class 29, subclass 25.35.

The restriction requirement is traversed. The fact that the Patent Office classifies Claims 1-17 and Claims 18-19 in different parts of its classification system does not show that these two groups of claims have acquired a separate status in the art. The classification system developed by the Patent Office has over 100,000 different categories and is intended to help Examiners and other individuals find references relatively quickly; not to show whether particular subjects are considered to be separate by those in the art. The classification system of the Patent Office is constantly being changed, clearly showing that it is not a good basis for making a permanent decision about whether two groups of

claims should be divided among two separate patent applications. As earlier stated, Applicants provisionally elect the subject matter of Group I, Claims 1-17.

The claims are also subject to species restriction requirements. The Examiner contends that the present application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species sets of the claimed invention:

Species Set:

- a) method wherein the step of transforming the ceramic tube into a piezoelectric crystal comprises shorting the transducer segments
- b) method wherein the step of transforming the ceramic tube into a piezoelectric crystal comprises poling the ceramic tube
- c) method further comprising the step of polishing the outer surface of the ceramic tube
- d) method further comprising the step of applying a matching layer to the transducer

In response to the species restriction requirement, Applicants provisionally elect "method further comprising the step

of applying a matching layer to the transducer" from the Species Set, which read upon Claims 1-7 and 14-17. Claims 1 is generic as set forth by the Examiner.

In addition, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to correct a clerical error. This amendment does not change the scope of Claim 1 and is not related to patentability.

Hence, it is respectfully urged that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the requirement for restriction and provide an action on the merits with respect to all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Vincent J. Serrao/

Vincent J. Serrao
Reg. No.: 47,072
Attorney for Applicant

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-1163